

Selection Statement
for the
Crew, Robotics, Avionics, and Vehicle Equipment Contract (A&B CRAVE)
Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center
(A-CRAVE Solicitation Number NNJ09BH0123R)
(B-CRAVE Solicitation Number NNJ09ZBH001-99R)

On June 2, 2010, along with other senior officials of the Johnson Space Center (JSC), I met with the Source Evaluation Board (the Board) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Crew, Robotics, Avionics, and Vehicle Equipment Contract Request for Proposal (RFP) Solicitation Number NNJ09BH0123R and NNJ09ZBH001-99R.

I. Background

The Crew, Robotics, Avionics, and Vehicle Equipment Contract (CRAVE) has a 5-year performance period and is scheduled to begin on June 15, 2010. The contract will be a multiple award (multi-award) Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF)/Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) contract with Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Delivery Orders (DOs). The procurement was conducted under full and open competition. The A-CRAVE solicitation was unrestricted for industry. The B-CRAVE solicitation was restricted to universities and non-profit institutions.

The CRAVE Contract covers engineering and manufacturing services such as for example: flight hardware and software design, development, testing and evaluation (DDT&E), certification, and delivery; non-flight/prototype hardware and software research and development; and sustaining engineering and/or processing of existing or previously certified equipment.

A draft RFP was issued on June 26, 2009. A Pre-Proposal Conference was held July 13, 2009. The final RFP was issued and posted to the internet on September 4, 2009 with a proposal due date of October 15, 2009. The final RFP was comprised of one sample CPFF DO (Sample DO-1) and one sample FFP DO (Sample DO-2). Timely proposals were received from the following four firms and one university.

A-CRAVE

- ATK Space Systems, Inc. (ATK)
- Oceaneering International, Inc. (OII)
- Hamilton Sundstrand Space Systems, Inc. (Hamilton Sundstrand)
- Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering (Wyle)

B-CRAVE

- University of Alabama at Birmingham (UAB)

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the Board developed four Mission Suitability evaluation sub-factors. The RFP described these sub-factors and listed the relative importance and weighting of each as set forth below:

Management Approach	300 Points
Technical Approach	500 Points
Safety & Health Approach	100 Points *
Small Business Utilization	100 Points
Total	1,000 Points

Past Performance Factor – The past performance for each Offeror was evaluated. In accordance with the RFP, adjective level of confidence ratings (i.e., “very high”, “high”, “moderate”, “low”, “very low”, and “neutral”) were utilized to assess past performance.

Cost/Price Factor –The Government performed price and cost analysis to determine the validity, balance, realism, and adequacy of the proposed pricing.

The RFP stated that the factors of Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance.

II. Evaluation of Initial Proposals

After a preliminary review of all proposals, the Board determined that all five proposals were acceptable. Each of the five proposals was then evaluated in accordance with the RFP as well as FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. At the completion of the initial evaluation, it was determined that OII, Wyle, and ATK's proposals were the most highly rated for A-CRAVE, and, therefore, were included in the competitive range. Hamilton Sundstrand was not included in the competitive range and as such was notified by letter dated February 3, 2010, of the results of their proposal evaluation. Hamilton Sundstrand requested a post-award debriefing by letter dated February 6, 2010.

Only UAB submitted a proposal for the B-CRAVE solicitation. The UAB proposal was evaluated in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70 for identification of unacceptable proposals and was found to be acceptable. Additionally, in accordance with NFS 1815.305-71 for evaluation of a single proposal, UAB's proposal was evaluated for acceptability but not scored. On January 22, 2010, in accordance with FAR 15.305(c), the Source Selection Authority established a competitive range of one Offeror, UAB, for purposes of conducting negotiations and to award after negotiating an acceptable contract.

III. Discussions and Evaluation/Findings of Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs)

ATK, OII, and Wyle were informed of their inclusion in the competitive range via letters dated February 3, 2010. The competitive range letters were distributed on February 4, 2010. On February 5, 2010, a representative from Wyle notified the Contracting Officer that their subcontractors' letter cited, "The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) has reviewed your proposal received in response to the subject RFP and has determined that ATK Space Systems proposal is in the competitive range and it will be necessary to hold discussions with your firm." As noted above, ATK is a prime contractor who is in the competitive range and is not a subcontractor to Wyle. The Wyle subcontractors are Orbital Technologies Corporation, Lockheed Martin, Aerodyne Industries, LZ Technology Inc., and Eagle Applied Sciences, LLC. Although not contacted by OII, an email from ePRO, a subcontractor to OII, stated their letter also cited ATK was in the competitive range. A review revealed that all of OII's subcontractors' letters contained the same statement. OII's subcontractors are DCI Services and Consulting, ePRO, LLC, Honeywell International, and the Boeing Company.

After reviewing all the subcontractor letters, it was verified that each subcontractor had received the correct enclosure with their respective pricing questions. Aside from indicating that ATK is in the competitive range, no other source selection information pertaining to ATK or their subcontractors was provided to the other Offerors. In addition, the ATK Senior Contracts Manager, was informed of the administrative oversight and he understood that it was inadvertent plus he stated that he was not concerned.

The NASA Contracting Officer (CO) determined that the above described administrative oversight, being in the context of a multi-award solicitation, does not prejudice any of the Offerors in the competitive range or otherwise compromise the integrity of the acquisition process associated with A-CRAVE. As such, in accordance with FAR 3.104-7(a)(1)(i), the CO determined there was no impact to the procurement and it should proceed.

Written discussions were held with all Offerors in the competitive range in an effort to address the model contract issues and cost questions, and to address all weaknesses in said Offerors' proposals. The revised model contracts were received on February 9, 2010. The responses to the cost questions and weaknesses were received on February 12, 2010. FPRs were received on February 19, 2010. Based upon the responses, the Board determined that face-to-face oral discussions would not be needed.

During review of the final presentation to the SSA, an issue arose with OII's pricing approach for the sample DOs. OII submitted two IDIQ Summary Cost Templates (ISCTs) for each sample DO in its initial proposal. The Board

considered the ISCTs compliant with the RFP and evaluated these ISCTs pursuant to Section M. The JSC procurement review team took a different view of OII's explanation. To them, it appeared that OII had submitted an alternate proposal because multiple ISCTs were submitted. This created an ambiguity as to which set of ISCTs constituted OII's proposed cost/price for the sample DOs. The RFP specifically states that the Government will not accept alternate proposals. This issue was vital to the source selection decision. The JSC procurement review team and the Board could not reach a consensus on this issue, which was further evidence of the existence of an ambiguity. In addition, the Board and reviewers discussed the fact that OII's prices were significantly higher than the independent Government cost estimate. Since the Board did not raise the issue of multiple ISCTs in discussions, the procurement review team questioned whether the discussions were meaningful. Discussions were subsequently reopened on May 18, 2010 and a second FPR was due May 25, 2010.

ATK and Wyle did not submit any changes in its proposal pursuant to the second FPR request. OII did submit a revision whereby it proposed one ISCT for each sample DO. The Board's final evaluations/findings are as follows:

ATK Space Systems, Inc

Mission Suitability: ATK received the following adjectival ratings: Management Approach—Excellent; Technical Approach—Very Good; Safety & Health—Excellent; and Small Business Utilization—Very Good. In regard to its Management Approach, the Board found that ATK proposed: (1) an effective team that can perform a wide range of tasks; (2) an effective means for executing DOs with the proper skill mix and expertise; and (3) an effective means for open communication between its team members and NASA. In regard to its Technical Approach, the Board found that ATK proposed: (1) an appropriate fabrication and testing approach; (2) an effective design solution for Sample DO-1; and (3) appropriate means for identifying and statusing Figures of Merit in both programmatic and technical areas. In regard to its Small Business Utilization Approach, the Board found that ATK proposed a means for exceeding the A-CRAVE small business goals.

Cost-Price: ATK's proposed cost was \$4.6 million and the Government's probable cost was \$4.6 million for the sample DOs. The Government's level of confidence in the probable cost is high.

Past Performance: ATK received a high level of confidence adjectival rating.

Oceaneering International Inc. (OII)

Mission Suitability: OII received the following adjectival ratings: Management Approach—Very Good; Technical Approach—Excellent; Safety & Health—Excellent; and Small Business Utilization—Good. In regard to its Management Approach, the Board found that OII proposed: (1) effective attraction, retention, and compensation programs; (2) an effective team with a broad range of expertise and capabilities; and (3) effective communication tools. The Board also found that OII's management organization lacks alignment with the NASA-JSC Engineering Directorate. In regard to its Technical Approach, the Board found that OII proposed: (1) a complete and effective work plan to accomplish the study for Sample DO-2; (2) an appropriate fabrication and processing approach; and (3) an effective design proposal for Sample DO-1. In regard to its Small Business Utilization Approach, the Board found that OII proposed an effective and efficient teaming plan.

Cost-Price: OII's proposed cost was \$6.1 million and the Government's probable cost was \$6.1 million for the sample DOs. The Government's level of confidence in the probable cost is high.

Past Performance: OII received a high level of confidence adjectival rating.

Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering

Mission Suitability: Wyle received the following adjectival ratings: Management Approach—Excellent; Technical Approach—Very Good; Safety & Health—Excellent; and Small Business Utilization—Good. In regard to its Management Approach, the Board found that Wyle proposed: (1) an effective team that can address a full range of

technology needs in a timely manner; (2) effective attraction, retention, and compensation programs; and (3) an effective means for open and timely communications. In regard to its Technical Approach, the Board found that Wyle proposed: (1) an effective and efficient design for Sample DO-1; (2) an appropriate recognition of the differences between operational and technology development programs; and (3) an effective and efficient DDT&E approach. The Board also found that Wyle proposed an inappropriate schedule for Sample DO-2. In regard to its Small Business Utilization Approach, the Board found that Wyle proposed an accelerated payment process for its small business subcontractors.

Cost-Price: Wyle proposed cost was \$5.0 million and the Government's probable cost was \$5.0 million for the sample DOs. The Government's level of confidence in the probable cost is high.

Past Performance: Wyle received a high level of confidence adjectival rating.

IV. Source Selection Decision

A-CRAVE

With respect to A-CRAVE, my decision was based on selecting the proposals offering the best value and consistency with the RFP's stated criteria for award in accordance with a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the source selection factors. I reviewed all "strengths" and "weaknesses" the Board found in the proposals and posed a variety of questions to the Board regarding its evaluations. After considering the Board's answers to my questions, I took no exceptions to its evaluation and adopted its findings. As noted above, the RFP stated that the factors of Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance.

In regard to the Mission Suitability factor, when considering the relative value of all the subfactors and associated findings, I determined that there were no significant discriminators among the three proposals. Further, with respect to Mission Suitability as a whole when considering all of its subfactors, I determined that each proposal provides excellent value to the Government in a comprehensive approach indicative of the merit of the Offeror's work to be performed or product(s) to be delivered under the actual contract. My determinations were based on the following:

For ATK's Management Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) an effective team that can perform a wide range of tasks; (2) an effective means for executing DOs with the proper skill mix and expertise; and (3) an effective means for open communication between its team members and NASA. For Wyle's Management Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) an effective team that can address a full range of technology needs in a timely manner; (2) effective attraction, retention, and compensation programs; and (3) an effective means for open and timely communications. For OII's Management Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) effective attraction, retention, and compensation programs; (2) an effective team with a broad range of expertise and capabilities; and (3) effective communication tools. The Board found that OII's management organization lacks alignment with the NASA-JSC Engineering Directorate which was determined by the Board to increase the risk that OII may not efficiently communicate with and respond to the concerns of the NASA customers in their performance of CRAVE work. However, given that OII has existing contracts with other government organizations, I determined that OII's proposed organizational structure was reasonable and the associated risk to NASA was minimal. In my comparative assessment, I focused on the benefits and risks associated with each proposal's Management Approach. Although I ultimately assigned an overall greater value with respect to ATK and Wyle's Management Approaches in comparison to OII's Management Approach, I determined that there were no significant discriminators among the three proposals.

For OII's Technical Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) a complete and effective work plan to accomplish the study for Sample DO-2; (2) an appropriate fabrication and

processing approach; and (3) an effective design proposal for Sample DO-1. For Wyle's Technical Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) an effective and efficient design for Sample DO-1; (2) a project engineering development flow that aligns with NASA-defined processes/an appropriate recognition of the differences between operational and technology development programs; and (3) an effective and efficient DDT&E approach. For ATK's Technical Approach, I assigned the highest relative value to the following findings: (1) an appropriate fabrication and testing approach; (2) an effective design solution for Sample DO-1; and (3) appropriate means for identifying and statusing Figures of Merit in both programmatic and technical areas. The Board found that Wyle proposed an inappropriate schedule for Sample DO-2, which I did determine to increase the Government's risk. However, I considered the "inappropriate schedule" finding in light of all the Board's findings for Wyle's Sample DO-2 proposal. For example, as stated above, the "project engineering development flow" finding is also applicable to Sample DO-2 and was assigned my highest relative value. Ultimately, I determined that any increase in risk due to the "inappropriate schedule" finding was minimal in light all the Board's findings for Wyle's Sample DO-2 proposal. In my comparative assessment, I focused on the benefits and risks associated with each proposal's Technical Approach. Although I ultimately assigned an overall greater value with respect to OII's Technical Approach in comparison to ATK and Wyle's Technical Approach and an overall greater value of ATK's Technical Approach in comparison to Wyle's Technical Approach, I determined that there were no significant discriminators among the three proposals.

In regard to the Safety & Health subfactor, ATK, OII, and Wyle each proposed an excellent Safety & Health approach to reducing and preventing injuries and illnesses, and thus, I determined that the Safety & Health subfactor was not a discriminator in my assessment.

In regard to the Small Business Utilization subfactor, ATK proposed a very good Small Business Utilization approach which demonstrated overall competence. OII and Wyle each proposed a good Small Business Utilization approach which shows a reasonable and sound response. There were no weaknesses associated with ATK, OII, or Wyle's Small Business Utilization approaches. Although I placed greater value on ATK's means for exceeding the A-CRAVE small business goals, I saw substantive value in OII's teaming proposal as well as Wyle's accelerated payment process for its small business subcontractors. And therefore, in my comparative assessment, I determine that there were no significant discriminators among the three Small Business Utilization approaches and that each Offeror at least adequately addressed how it will actively engage small businesses in the development of technical products.

In regard to the Cost/Price factor, the Board determined that the proposed costs for ATK, OII, and Wyle's proposals were reasonable based on each Offeror's proposed skill set and approach. Further, the Board determined that the Government has a high level of confidence in the probable costs for all proposals. I determined that each of three unique approaches and skill sets was reasonable and underscores the plurality of possible proposals for any given DO. Further, the A-CRAVE RFP required that Not-To-Exceed (NTE) values were to be used in pricing the sample DOs. I considered the facts that less than NTE values may be used in actual DOs and that actual DOs will be competitively awarded in regard to my benefit/risk analysis. I determined that the risk associated with a reasonable, higher price in a sample DO is substantially reduced due to the availability of proposing less than NTE values in an actual DO subject to a competitive environment. In my comparative assessment, given the totality of circumstances, I determined that there were no significant discriminators with respect to the Cost/Price factor.

In regard to the Past Performance factor, ATK, OII, and Wyle each received a high level of confidence adjectival rating, which demonstrates very effective past performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements. And therefore, in my comparative assessment, I determine that there were no significant discriminators with respect to Past Performance.

There were no issues in regard to how ATK, OII, or Wyle priced its proposal or whether or not an Offeror demonstrated an understanding of the RFP requirements. Each of ATK, OII, and Wyle's proposals demonstrated an understanding of JSC's unique requirements and provided what I view to be proposals that offer excellent value.

A&B CRAVE Selection Statement

I have determined that ATK, OII, and Wyle's proposals, based on Mission Suitability and Past Performance, essentially provide equal relative value to the Government. Further, I have determined that there are no significant discriminators between ATK, OII, and Wyle's proposals based on Cost/Price. Consistent with the solicitation's selection criteria, I have determined that ATK, OII, and Wyle's proposals essentially provide equal relative value to the Government and therefore, I select ATK, OII, and Wyle for award of A-CRAVE.

B-CRAVE

With respect to B-CRAVE and as mentioned subsection II of this Statement, UAB was the only Offeror. The CO determined that UAB's proposal was acceptable, comprehensive, and complete. Further, UAB's proposed cost was \$4.6 million and the Government's probable cost was \$4.6 million for the sample DOs. The CO also determined that UAB's price was reasonable based on established criteria. I concurred with the CO's determinations.

There were no issues in regard to how UAB priced its proposal or whether or not it demonstrated an understanding of the RFP requirements. UAB's proposal demonstrated an understanding of JSC's unique requirements and provided what I view to be a responsive solution. Therefore, consistent with the solicitation's selection criteria, I select UAB for award of B-CRAVE.

Ellen Ochoa

Ellen Ochoa
Source Selection Authority

14 Jun 2010

Date